The Sun.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 17, 1908.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, Per Month $0 50
DAILY, Per Year 6 00
SUNDAY, Per Year 2 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year 8 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month 70
Postage to foreign countries added.

Published by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York. President and Treasurer of the Association, William M. Laffan, 170 Nassau street; Secretary of the Association, Franklin Bartlett, 5 Nassau street.

Paris office, 32 Rue Louis le Grand. The daily and Sunday editions are on sale at Kiosque 12, near the Grand Hotel; Kiosque 77, Boulevard des Capucines, corner Place de l'Opéra, and Kiosque 19, Boulevard des Italiens, corner Rue Louis le Grand.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have rejected articles returned they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

The Army Canteen and the Tariff.

The Army Canteen Association of New York, the object of whose organization is to persuade Congress to establish canteens at every army post and the national soldiers' homes, has drafted a bill which a New York Representative will introduce this week. The association talks of appointing committees in every State with instructions to mould public opinion in favor of the army canteen.

We cannot sufficiently admire the spirit and resourcefulness of the new association, but two things it seems to forget: that there will be an election of members of the House of Representatives in November next; and that an anti-alcoholic liquor wave is sweeping the country, threatening the rum power even in its strongholds. The Sixtieth Congress includes 109 new members, who see a glorious political career opening before them; there are besides 289 Representatives who know a popular movement, or craze, when they see it, and who are not in the habit of advocating any measure that contains anything looking like nitroglycerine.

Experience tells us that the worst time to agitate for an army canteen is the period that precedes a national election. It is an exigency when the bravest souls are perturbed and the timid fly. Complicate such a crisis with a sentiment that the rum power is on the defensive and you can't get the average Congressman to admit that it would be safe to talk out in meeting about the wisdom of restoring the canteen. Although we have ever contended that it would be a sensible thing to do, in spite of the belief of the W. C. T. U. and other equally sincere temperance societies to the contrary, we are inclined to think that the statesmen in Congress will class the canteen with tariff revision, as a question that presses and should be settled right—but not until after the Presidential election.

Professor Miliukoff on Russia's Recent History.

It is a depressing view of Russia's immediate future that is taken by Professor PAUL MILIUKOFF, who, just before his departure from America, reviewed the exciting events of the twenty-six months that have followed the issuance of the reform ukase on October 30, 1905. He summed up the situation in two words when he said that the state of parties in the third Duma, as well as the state of things in the country at large, is one of "unstable equilibrium."

The phrase certainly describes correctly the condition of the third Duma, which in respect of composition differs materially from its two predecessors. In the first Duma, which Count WITTE not unnaturally expected would be controlled by the delegates of the peasants, who constitute 85 per cent. of Russia's population, the Constitutional Democrats, who represent the intellectual classes, did as a matter of fact secure a majority. Desiring neither revolution and a republic nor a relapse into the old autocracy, the Cadets might have brought Russia safely through the first stage of political transformation had they not been hampered by the Social Democrats and the so-called Group of Toil, whose violent demonstrations gave the Government a pretext for the dissolution of the chamber. In the second Duma the Constitutional Democrats were weaker than they had been before, and consequently more dependent on the radical factions, so that the second chamber was short lived and unfruitful.

It is the third Duma whose condition peculiarly deserves to be described as one of "unstable equilibrium." As Professor MILIUKOFF pointed out—not in his lecture at Carnegie Hall but in a preceding interview—the third Duma is divided into three parts, each of which contains about 150 members. Not one of those sections, however, is compact and homogeneous. The Octobrists, who occupy the centre and who represent in different shades the relatively Liberal element of the land owning class, number, as we have said, 150, and immediately on their left sit the so-called Progressives, a new party which has about fifty representatives. On the right of the chamber sit the Reactionaries, who number rather less than 150 and are divided between monarchists, who are willing to tolerate a national assembly of a conservative type, and the Absolutists, who openly advocate a restoration of the autocracy. The left of the Progressives are the Constitutional Democrats, who can now muster but fifty spokesmen, and beyond these are about eighty-five Deputies representing various factions, all more or less radical.

Under the circumstances it is obvious that union of the Progressives, Constitutional Democrats and the more radical Oups, even if it could be formed, would not be strong enough to control the chamber. For that purpose a majority of about 230 would be needed. This could be formed in two ways: either by a combination of the 150 Octobrists, the 50 Progressives and the 50 Cadets, or by a combination of the Monarchists and the Octobrists. It is the latter combination by which the business of the third Duma is now temporarily transacted, but at any moment the more liberal half of the Octobrists may secede and combine with the Constitutional Democrats to overthrow the dominant Conservatives. That is the actual situation, and Professor MILIUKOFF can see no hope for much improvement until measures shall have been taken to give the scores of millions of peasants an elementary education. The process of teaching them, which will require the work of many years, is not yet even begun, and it is uncertain whether a bill appropriating $2,500,000 for Government primary schools will be passed by the present chamber.

One would have liked to hear Professor MILIUKOFF discuss the actual and prospective condition of his country from a financial point of view. As a Russian patriot, however, who naturally would wish not to impair his nation's credit on foreign exchanges, he evidently deemed it expedient to maintain on that subject a judicious reticence. All he said was that a discussion of the budget would be the first, and he might have added the principal, work of the present chamber and is likely to occupy some six weeks. He knows—no one better—the real amount of the deficit already existing, and he knows the imperative necessity of procuring a large loan abroad if national bankruptcy is to be averted. He made no reference to it, nevertheless, nor to the insuperable difficulty of carrying out the naval programme which is imputed to the Czar NICHOLAS II., and which is alleged to contemplate the expenditure of nearly two billions of dollars on shipbuilding during the nex ten years.

The Best Southern Song.

The tune and no the words makes the fortune of a song; and one can imagine with what spirit and satisfaction the soldiers of the civil war roared any singable or familiar air. Lucky were the poets whose more or less halting verses were pulled along by "Dixie," "Yankee Doodle" or the "Marseillaise," "Hail Columbia," "John Brown's Body."

As a rule the more ambitious and famous the poet the less likely he was to please the troops or posterity. It is true that "The Battle Hymn of the Republic," the most illustrious of the Northern songs, was the composition of an accomplished writer, but Mrs. HOWE had not in 1861 that glory which has been accumulating for her since. The best poems of the war in the judgment of many were written by obscure men like BROWNELL. JAMES RYDER RANDALL was hardly more than a boy when he wrote "Maryland." If not a great poem it is a great song, and it has undeniable fire and "go" in it:

"The despot's heel is on thy shore,
Maryland!
His torch is at thy temple door,
Maryland!
Avenge the patriotic gore
That flecked the streets of Baltimore,
And be the battle queen of yore,
Maryland, my Maryland!"

Married to the air of "Lauriger Horatius," "My Maryland" became an almost faultless vehicle first of Southern aspiration and the State pride of Maryland, even if Maryland refused to "spurn the Northern scum" as drastically as young RANDALL hoped, and then a national song, with more passion, melody, gayety and good red blood than any other that is generally known in the United States. Compared with it "Dixie," however catching, seems trivial. "My Maryland" has the genuine call and thrill in it; and it is highly singable. It is unfortunate that the "Star Spangled Banner" is almost unsingable.

So JAMES RYDER RANDALL, after a long life of journalism, bids fair to be long remembered as the maker of a really national song, for "My Maryland" has long lost any sectional connotation.

The President and Saddleback Reform.

The subjoined remarks, under the heading "Now the New York Paper Knows," are from the editorial columns of our valued contemporary the *Courant* of Hartford. They are prematurely conceived and impose upon THE SUN an imperative if not particularly pleasant journalistic duty:

"Last month THE SUN had an access of curiosity about an order prescribing certain tests in horsemanship at the Military Academy and providing that according to the results of these tests the cadets shall be graded as 'specially qualified for mounted service,' 'qualified,' and 'not qualified.' Perhaps it suspected—quite excusably—a personal intervention on the part of the enthusiastic and expert horseman of the White House, whom it dislikes. 'What,' it asked, 'is the mystery of the mind that originated the West Point order?'

"The question is promptly answered—promptly and authoritatively. Major-General J. F. BELL, Chief of Staff, informs THE SUN that the tests were originally recommended by General GEORGE H. BURTON, then Inspector-General of the Army, but now on the retired list. The 'by direction of the President' in the order is mere formula; War Department regulations for the Military Academy are always issued that way. 'The Commander in Chief of the Army was never consulted on this subject,' writes the Chief of Staff, 'never gave any orders about it, and so far as I know is not aware of the existence of the order.' So THE SUN now has the information it asked for."

On Monday last we printed without comment the statement of Major-General BELL to which the *Courant* refers in the foregoing passage, together with all of the documents which came as appendices to his communication.

It is evident that the *Courant* has not studied these accompanying papers with intelligent diligence before forming the conclusions which it now imparts to us with such gentle irony. The suspicion that the order for a special classification of the West Point cadets in respect of agility and tenacity in the saddle was in any degree due to "personal intervention on the part of the enthusiastic and expert horseman of the White House" is dismissed "authoritatively" by our Connecticut contemporary on the strength of General BELL'S letter of January 7 to THE SUN. In that letter the Chief of Staff says, as the *Courant* points out:

"The Commander in Chief of the Army was never consulted on this subject, never gave any orders about it, and so far as I know is not aware of the existence of the order. The order, however, embodies the usual formula, 'by direction of the President,' because regulations for the Military Academy are so issued."

But this passage, which the *Courant* has overlooked, is contained in Major-General BELL'S memorandum of November 25, 1907, for the Acting Secretary of War, which he sent us for publication, and which we published, in connection with his letter to THE SUN:

"Is there any one well acquainted with the average degree of efficiency attained in riding and horsemanship by graduates of the Military Academy who will dispute that additional incentive and inducement in this line is desirable? I don't think many persons have ever thought much, or are fully aware, of how greatly the real efficiency of mounted officers is reduced by lack of ability in riding and horsemanship. The President is keenly alive to it, and even if it were not right and proper to assign those 'specially' qualified to the mounted service, *it would be necessary in order to comply with the spirit of instructions received from him.*"

We shall not attempt to analyze or explain the apparent discrepancy between the two statements. What is absolutely certain is that this estimable officer and gentleman has not intended to mislead the *Courant*, or anybody else, regarding the extent of the Chief Magistrate's participation in the matter in question. It may be that he had one thing in his mind in writing the words quoted by the *Courant*, while that newspaper had another thing in mind when it read them. It may be that General BELL was thinking merely of the detail of a horsemanship test by an extraneous committee instead of by the West Point instructors themselves, while the *Courant* assumed that he was referring to the whole broad question of classification according to horsemanship. If may be that there is some slight lack of clarity and some unconscious inconsistency in General BELL'S presentation of the subject.

At all events, we may be pardoned for suggesting, in view of the foregoing exhibit, that our esteemed contemporary in Hartford has been talking without knowing what it was talking about.

Fruit From a Sacred Tree.

A press report from Mexico of very recent date moves us to suggest some changes in the civil service curriculum for consular agents. We understand, of course, that the Government's methods for ascertaining real talent, in this as in almost all other cases, is practically perfect. How indeed could it be otherwise when for long years the solicitudes, the inspirations and the activities of the superior classes have been concentrated upon that halcyon consummation? Nevertheless, the examiners of applicants for consular positions ought to know that alligators do not infest streams on the edge of the Mexican plateau, and that even where they prevail at all they are not given to devouring young persons accidentally cast into the waters inhabited by them.

We are told in the despatch which has prompted these perfectly respectful observations that "Dr. WILL B. DAVIS, American consular agent at Guadalajara, has been advised that two Americans, names not known, a man about twenty-eight years old and a young woman about nineteen, were thrown out of a boat while travelling down the Balsas River and that both were eaten by alligators before they could be rescued." There is something more, about a trunk which "sank in the riv r and has not been recovered." These are mere unimportant details. The matter of real consequence is that a graduate of our civil service tribunal, after long years of Mugwump guidance and instruction, should be capable of telegraphing to the State Departmen a roorback so transparent and so expensive. It is bad enough to be denied the opportunity of identifying these adventurous but unfortunate victims. It is given to few if any to have themselves devoured by alligators in an upland Mexican river while actually struggling toward the shore. Surely a distinction so rare should not be forbidden to memories both deserving and unique.

But this is not all or nearly all. The question of real consequence is, Who advised Consular Agent WILL B. DAVIS, and how does it happen that he didn't know better?

These alligator stories do well enough for Florida, where Northern tourists, exhausted by the humidity, the high prices and a long course of refrigerated food, are naturally eager to get some little excitement for their vanished money, since they can discern no other prospect. To the winter sojourner in that prodigal and caloric land it is a valued privilege to hear from time to time of moving accidents by flood and field with some one else as the central figure of the tragedy, and actually a luxury to imagine that even an alligator has enjoyed the luxury of fresh meat. As a matter of fact, however, our strictly official communications should be more or less informed by the verities. The young people in question have no doubt disappeared and their trunk has followed them into an impenetrable boskage. But they were not devoured by alligators in the Balsas River or any other stream, and civil service reform must be as great a humbug as its worst enemies have declared if a product of that boasted machine can be induced to father such a yarn.

Rural Free Delivery Routes.

A bill introduced in the House of Representatives by the Hon. WYATT AIKEN of the Third South Carolina district proposes that no rural free delivery route shall be discontinued without the approval of the Representative in whose district it lies, unless the Post Office Department gives a year's notice of its intention to take away the service, and directs the Postmaster-General to shorten or lengthen existing routes, to equalize the work of the carriers as much as possible, "such changes, when all facts are obtained relative thereto, to be submitted to the Representative as heretofore provided."

The possibilities of such an enactment are positively awe inspiring. The enthusiasm with which any Representative in Congress would indorse a plan for the abandonment of a mail route must be apparent. The business advantage to the Government of cutting down the payroll by stopping an unprofitable distribution of letters and papers would appeal with great effect to a statesman hunting for delegates or striving for reelection. The necessity of consulting the Representative from the district involved before making any changes in the carrying of the mails would unquestionably make for good administration.

A notable bill, but it does not go far enough. There should be a separate post office department for every Congress district, and the Representative should be Postmaster-General ex officio.

A West Virginia Convention.

The sympathy of all the friends of civil service reform is assured to the convention of the postmasters of West Virginia. They have been in solemn and excited session at Morgantown. They did not linger long over narrow professional topics relating to the conduct of the Post Offices. They had business more immediate to their souls. Soon the convention, the despatches tell us, "resolved itself into a large political gathering, nearly all the candidates for various State offices being present." And larger issues even than State offices engaged and perturbed those servants of the people:

"TAFT is almost the unanimous choice of the postmasters for President, and they favor an instructed delegation. At the same time they bitterly denounce Senators ELKINS and SCOTT for their attempt to get up an anti-Taft delegation."

ELKINS and SCOTT are inveterate politicians, rebellious now after the manner of their kind against the edict of the Imperial Elector.

In too many other States a similar contumacy is known to exist.

The honors are certainly with the intrepid Mr. OCHS. He pursued his adversary into court and then and there relentlessly compelled him to discontinue his defence.

When a tall mercantile building which was supposed to be fireproof because if it had been constructed as the law provides it should have been fireproof—when such a structure burns up as readily as a wooden barn stuffed with hay, then it seems about time to inquire whether there is any truth in this ugly intimation contained in the National Board of Fire Underwriters' special report of November, 1905, on the fire hazard in Manhattan and The Bronx:

"Violations of the law are still occurring in buildings of the speculative type. * * * The incompetency or inefficiency due to other causes, of individuals in the [Manhattan building] department has been demonstrated beyond dispute, and while direct culpability may not attach to the administrative heads of the departments, it is certain that much responsibility rests upon them for undesirable conditions."

I'm no politician and never was. I'm just a plain Yankee farmer, practising law for seven months in the year.—*Ex-Governor* FRANK S. BLACK.

No really plain Yankee farmer works less than twelve months a year.

Surely that was a wholesome sight revealed to the young paper person who reports that he found at the Manhattan Opera House "many" who declared that LUISA TETRAZZINI "excelled the peerless song bird JENNY LIND." That song bird, now perching lower in the musical memory of the many, sang in 1850 where the no more lovely angel fishes now are, in Castle Garden. Sturdy boys these New York first nighters; they supped that night, fifty-eight years ago, at the Astor House after hearing JENNY LIND, as they supped Wednesday night at the Hotel Astor. The world moves not for them as for others; their calendar is a measure not of years but of miles. Robust young bucks of eighty-five opera seasons as they are, their world has moved merely four miles along Broadway, from Battery Park to Long Acre Square.

Who are the bosses?—*Albany Evening Journal.*

That is what your friend the Hon. EDGAR TRUMAN BRACKETT seems anxious to ascertain.

A clear headed and unpretentious American diplomat who after serving well his own country had been of great use to a foreign Government was EDWARD H. STROBEL, who died on Wednesday at Bangkok while acting as general adviser to the King of Siam. Minister to Chile at 42, with an excellent record, doubtless the return of the Republicans to power in 1897 alone cut short a career of great promise in the diplomatic service. Indeed, while he was later holding the Bemis professorship of international law at Harvard, a Republican Secretary of State, JOHN HAY, when asked by a Representative of the Siamese Government to suggest an American to advise his royal master, named Professor STROBEL. Thus through the larger international amenity he returned to a kind of usefulness from which party exigency had debarred him at home.

In March, 1907, was concluded the special task to which above all others he had been expected to devote himself in the Malay Peninsula. This was the consummation of the French treaty. The long and sharp dispute over the boundary between French Indo-China and Siam was one in which not only the French were concerned, for if encroachments continued the integrity of CHULALONKORN'S empire itself might be in jeopardy, and with it trade interests of England, Denmark, Germany, China and Japan. The new commercial importance of the Pacific gives Siam a strategic consequence, and no European or Asiatic Power would willingly see her pass into control of one of the others. By the treaty which Professor STROBEL induced the French commissioner to agree to Siam cedes Battambang, Sisophon and Siemreap, while France gives up Dan-ai, the province of Keat and adjacent islands. French Asiatics in the Siamese empire come under the jurisdiction of the Siamese courts without extraterritorial circumlocution, and stability of the status quo is assured.

It was characteristic of Mr. STROBEL that although enduring tortures from the malady which has now resulted in his death he toiled without intermission during nearly the whole month of March last year in order that he might complete before the King's departure for France this boundary treaty, perhaps the most important instrument of its kind ever agreed to in so short a time. He was as modest as he was self-sacrificing. No advertisement made him celebrated, no newspaper had ever been able to obtain his photograph.

De Armond Was There.

From the Washington Herald.

An inquisitive member of the fair sex was taken down to see how the House does things by one of the Representatives the other day, and she was introduced to a large number of Congressmen. She did not pay much attention to names, for she was too busy acquiring knowledge.

Finally she had a short, slender, deep voiced man presented to her and she caught the title "Congressman."

"Oh," she said, "and were you here when the Williams-De Armond scrap was pulled off the other day?"

"Perhaps," suggested the Congressman with dignity, "you did not catch my name."

"Your name? Why, I don't believe I did," she replied, with engaging frankness.

"My name," continued the Congressman, "is De Armond."

Saved!

Sheridan had just ridden to Winchester twenty miles away.

"Five miles over the Roosevelt test," he gasped.

Herewith he felt reasonably sure of holding his job.

THE SALE OF THE "LONDON TIMES."

LONDON, Jan. 8.—One of England's proudest national institutions, the Thunderer, has fallen into the hands of the Philistines. That is how English conservatism interprets the announcement of the change of control which appeared yesterday on the editorial page of the *Times*. Despite all evidence to the contrary which the public fads and fancies of the moment may indicate, conservatism remains the dominant characteristic of the British race. The fall of the House of Lords itself before the hosts of Socialism would scarcely disturb more thoroughly the peace of mind of the average Englishman than this blow to his national pride. And yet if he is asked to explain just why he is shocked and infuriated, his answers in the present stage of his feelings are principally in expletives. He talks about "upstarts in journalism," the importation of "detestable American methods," the "blow to national dignity."

It will be difficult for the American reader to understand how strict and jealous is the English censorship of "the leading journal." A few months ago the *Times* adopted the innovation of indicating the subject of each of its editorials by a headline identical typographically with those which appear on THE SUN'S editorial page. It had been necessary during the previous century or so to read a quarter of a column or more of a *Times* leader before discovering what was the real subject under discussion. The change brought forth many violent protests. I happened to discuss journalism with an intelligent English lady who had read the *Times* religiously all her long life. "Think of the *Times* doing such a vulgar thing!" she exclaimed in righteous indignation. "I have stopped my paper."

But the *Times* has offended popular taste in ways far more serious during the past few years than that which drove the old lady to change the habit of a lifetime. It has continued to be the great newspaper it always was, but it has ventured into fields quite outside the scope of journalism, with an effect which has by no means enhanced its dignity. Its exploits as the purveyor of an encyclopædia and other works and as the proprietor of a book club which is engaged in a bitter controversy with the publishing trade have certainly brought it no credit from the journalistic point of view. Its struggle to reduce the big profits which book publishers demand would awaken far greater public sympathy and support if the *Times* was in fact a disinterested champion of the cause it advocates. So there have been many shakings of the head among the *Times's* supporters, many uncomfortable references to "pound of tea" journalism, and sad expressions of suspicion of the strict *bona fides* of some branches of the management. In fact, the prestige of the *Times* has suffered some damage at home if not abroad during these latter years.

And yet the *Times* continues to be in many respects the greatest newspaper ever published. It is a true historian of the British Empire and of the world. Its contents day by day stand in a true perspective in the light of history, however much they may fail to satisfy the man in the street. The "human" and the personal element finds no expression in the columns of the *Times*, except occasionally in its law reports. I have said that the *Times* is a faithful historian of the world's events; so it is with one exception. It prints the news of all the world except that of London. It is becoming more symmetrical in this respect, but more than once it has been guilty of such an anomaly as giving greater prominence and space to an event on the continent than to a happening of more intrinsic importance in the metropolis. The pride of the *Times*, and justly so, is its foreign page. Its unexampled corps of foreign correspondents can hardly be surpassed in statesmanlike ability by the official diplomatic representation of any country. So long as this is maintained at its traditional high standard the *Times* will continue to be the greatest unofficial political power that the world knows.

Why should a change in the proprietorship of this great organ of public opinion excite popular opposition and indignation? The answer, the unreasonable answer, is because *any* change would have that effect. It should be said at once that there has been no public expression of popular feeling on the subject. The contemporaries of the *Times* have said only kind things about Mr. C. Arthur Pearson, the new director of the paper. The amenities of journalism are much more polite in London than in other countries. But there is no mistaking the almost universal chorus of protest that has been heard in the city, in the clubs and wherever men of brains and position congregate during the two or three days since the fact became known. It is curious too that the indignation is as pronounced among non-readers and political opponents as among the *Times's* subscribers. This is because the paper is everywhere regarded by Englishmen as a great national institution in something of the same sense as the Houses of Parliament and Westminster Abbey. The Walter family have controlled it for a century. It has always posed as independent in politics, and for many years it was the organ of the Government, whichever party happened to be in power. During its later years it has been consistently Unionist, and it is of course opposed to the present Government in most of its domestic policy. But it is non-partisan in foreign affairs, and in that sense it continues to be the representative British newspaper.

Mr. Pearson is of the same political faith as the *Times*, and he has declared that he will make no change in the policy or editorial management of the paper. That declaration is dictated by ordinary common sense, and Mr. Pearson is equipped with plenty of that commodity. It must be admitted that there are personal reasons for the resentment over his advent in Printing House Square. They are reasons, however, which would carry no weight in any capital except London. His career as a successful journalist has been phenomenally rapid and he is still a young man. Conservative Englishmen always scent danger in a meteoric success and they withhold confidence. Mr. Pearson already controls three important London journals—the *Daily Express*, the *Standard*, and the *Evening Standard and St. James's Gazette*. The *Express* is one of the brightest, cleanest and best one cent papers published in this or any other country. It has an enormous circulation and it is a very profitable property. Its chief political mission the past year has been to oppose the rising tide of socialistic fallacies, and most ably has its campaign been conducted. The *Standard* has not gained the same business success since Mr. Pearson bought it three years ago. He encountered even greater popular prejudice among the paper's clientèle than he will meet now, because he reversed the policy of the paper upon the vital question of tariff reform. The readers of the *Standard* deserted almost en masse, and the paper has since been engaged in the slow task of gathering together a new constituency. The new *Standard* is a better newspaper than the old and it has certainly avoided the evil which is the bête noir of conservative Englishmen—sensationalism. This has been perhaps the only one of Mr. Pearson's many journalistic ventures which has not won financial success, but it may be surmised that he hardly expected it in this instance, for he has shown himself willing to make serious sacrifices in the cause of Mr. Chamberlain's policy of fiscal reform.

A man of enormous energy—Mr. Chamberlain once described him as the greatest hustler he ever met—Mr. Pearson has gained the leadership of the British press solely by his own exertions. His enemies sometimes describe him as a "trailer," never an originator, but he has succeeded in distancing his only rival in the English journalistic field, Lord Northcliff. His personal fortune is not large according to American standards, and other capitalists, notably Sir Alexander Henderson, another self-made man, are associated with him in securing the control of the *Times*.

It will be a matter of almost worldwide interest to watch the development of the *Times* under the new management. It would be a safe prophecy to say that the readers of the Thunderer will scarcely be able to detect a change. Its two great features—the foreign telegrams and the "Letters to the Editor"—will be strengthened and improved. The Englishman with a grievance will always rush to the *Times*, no matter who may be its proprietor. It is in the business departments of the paper that important changes will be made. They are necessary, but they do not concern the outside public. The alarm of British conservatism for the dignity and stability of the Thunderer is not well founded. It will continue to be the unofficial mouthpiece of the empire and to give expression to the best thought and to defend the interests of the British people. H. R. C.

THE BOOK OF MARTYRS.

More Suggestions for the Title of That Famous Work.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Permit me to suggest as titles for Mr. A. Edward Newton's forthcoming book: "Bugs I Have Met," after Thompson Seton; "The Complete Bughunter," after Izaak Walton; "The Bug in the House," after Walter Pater; "Four-'Leven-Forty-four, or the Policy Players' Guide," after Paul Conrad; "A Thesaurus of Shorter and Ugller Words," after Peter Mark Roget; "The Repairer of Reputations," after Robert W. Chambers; "A Tale of Negative Gravity," after Frank R. Stockton; "Nonsense Books," after Edward Lear; "Dream Days," after Kenneth Grahame; "Folly in Fairyland," after Carolyn Wells; "Love's Labor's Lost," after W. Shakespeare. H. P.

WILMINGTON, Del., January 15.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* As a title for Mr. A. Edward Newton's "Book of Martyrs," containing the portraits of persons who have been castigated by a Great Man, with excerpts from the speeches of the latter relative thereto, I would modestly suggest the following: "Chin Music From the Lyre That Never Rests, by the Author of 'The Winning of the West.'"

SYRACUSE, January 15. M. E. WILSON.

MEMORIALS OF FAME.

Jersey Bills in Honor of the Good Gray Poet and a Quaker Preacher.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I enclose two bills that I have sent to the Trenton Legislature this week. D. H. WRIGHT.

PHILADELPHIA, January 16.

Be it enacted that an appropriation of $2,500 be made for the purchase and care of the two story frame house and ground thereunto attached known as No. 328 Mickle street, Camden, N. J., which was occupied by the poet Walt Whitman during the last days of his life.

Be it enacted that an appropriation of $2,500 be made for the purchase and care of the John Woolman workshop and some two acres of ground, more or less, thereunto attached, situate at the foot of Garden street, at Mount Holly, N. J

A BITTER CRY FROM THE SOUTH.

Mountain Whites Neglected While Millions Go to Negro Education.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The regular procession of bequests during the last year for the education of the Southern negro inspires the query: Why are the poor children of the white Southern mountaineers forgotten, while millions are devoted to the education of the negro?

In the mountain ranges of North Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, Kentucky, West Virginia and Virginia there are thousands of children of school age who have no adequate school facilities and who are struggling for an education. Most of the mountain counties in this section are too poor to have a school term of more than two or three months, and the salaries they can offer are not enough to attract competent teachers.

These children are descendants of the purest English, Scotch and Irish blood in America, and in the exceptional instances where they have had the advantages of a good education the result has proved that they were entirely worthy of it. Even as poor as the present facilities are, the children walk miles every day during the worst season of the year and over rough mountain trails to attend school.

In conversations with the fathers of these children the invariable opening remark on nearly every subject will be, in a tone of regret, "I am an uneducated man," and if the subject of their progeny is brought up the determination to see that they receive all possible schooling is expressed almost fiercely, showing how keen is the sense of their own deficiencies.

I am not opposed to the education of the negro, but when so many thousands of dollars are given every year for that purpose it seems to me that if a realization of the true facts could be brought home to the generous donors of various education funds some part at least of these large sums would be devoted to the education of the poor children of our own people. P. T. FARNSWORTH.

HIGHLANDS, N. C., January 14.

An All Star Ticket.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I move to amend the nomination of Taft and Woodruff for President and Vice-President and make it Woodruff and Lew Dockstader.

NEW YORK, January 16. E. S. L.

A Letter From Eugene Baylor.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Some unknown friend has sent me a clipping from THE SUN of January 14 relative to one of my early musical compositions, "The Margrave Galop," improvised one evening at Miss Mary Pegram's charming home in Richmond, Va., in March, 1864, when as a young Major in the Confederate army I had gone with my cousin, General Lewis A. Armistead (killed afterward in Pickett's charge at Gettysburg), and Prince C. J. Bolignac of France, just appointed a Lieutenant-Colonel, afterward a Major-General.

Returning to New Orleans after the war, the "Margrave" was published and at once took the city by storm. Returning footsore but cheerful after the ordeal of Forts Jackson and St. Philip, Bragg's campaign into Kentucky, Stone River, part of the siege of Vicksburg, Johnston's campaign from Dalton to Atlanta, three months in a hospital, a long march up to Greensboro, N. C., &c., four years in all, I was mighty glad to get $100 in gold for "The Margrave Galop" and sit down to a good dinner at Victor's with a party of hungry comrades, even if the publisher did make $2,000 out of it. EUGENE BAYLOR.

WINCHESTER, Va., January 15.

Result of Transit Improvements.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* As your Bronx correspondent states, the Interborough Company should consider the advisability of extending the subway beyond 177th street.

I had occasion to go up through the "annexed district" some days ago, and was surprised to note the vast improvement that has taken place in the Van Ness and Williamsbridge sections, which formerly were a day's ride out of New York. It seems only a few years since we used to ride on the little dinky horse car on the way to picturesque Morris Park, while now that territory is gridironed with trolleys, and the streets are fast assuming the aspect of our busy Manhattan thoroughfares.

The one thing wanting, apparently, is the subway. W. J. O'BRIEN.

NEW YORK, January 16.

Perplexity of a Beginner.

Adam meditated gloomily.

"I am the first man, all right," he remarked, "but I don't know which band wagon to pick."

Thus his life went, as it were, by default.

IVINS HEARING RESUMED.

Present, Mr. William M. Ivins and the Jury of Taxpayers of the State of New York.

Mr. Ivins, are you prepared to tell the jury this morning—now that you have had an ample opportunity to examine your books and memoranda and otherwise refresh your memory—exactly how as chief counsel for the Fassett committee you came to spend those sums of money for which you put in a general charge in Schedule B, as to which you have heretofore been examined?

Are you prepared to tell how that $100 was spent for "expenses of investigating the Excise Board and the licensed places," meaning the saloons of New York city?

Are you prepared to tell the great jury of taxpayers of the State the details for the total expense of $1,328 included in your five general charges in Schedule B of "expenses of departmental investigation"?

In fact, Mr. Ivins, are you ready to go on this morning and explain all of the items in Schedule B for which you made a general charge?

If you are not ready to explain to the people of the State how their money was spent by you as chief counsel for the Fassett committee, perhaps you will be ready to explain how as chief counsel for the Friday Assembly committee to inquire into the cause of the railway strike in the city of Brooklyn you put in a bill for $6,000?

To be more explicit with you, Mr. Ivins; and in order that you may refresh your memory, the exact wording of the bill for $6,000 which you put in to the State will be read to you. It is as follows:

THE STATE OF NEW YORK
TO
WILLIAM M. IVINS, Dr.,

For professional services as counsel to the committee of the Assembly appointed to inquire into the cause of the railway strike in the city of Brooklyn, in conducting the investigation, the securing and introduction of documentary and other evidence, examination of all documents and evidence in the cause and the preparation of report and bills, being a continuous service from February 7 to April 8, 1895..... $6,000

In other words, Mr. Ivins, you put in a general bill for services for exactly two months work for $6,000, which is at the rate of $36,000 a year, did you not?

Will you tell the jury, Mr. Ivins, whether this bill was paid by the State without question, as other bills of yours have been paid?

What does this "Pay $4,016.66" in blue lead pencil notation on this bill mean, Mr. Ivins?

What does this "Certified at $6,000. William H. Friday, chairman of committee, June 26, 1895" noted on the bill mean, Mr. Ivins?

It appears from the face of the bill, "Paid June 27, 1895, Comptroller's Office," that this bill was paid. That is true, is it not, Mr. Ivins?

What sum did you actually receive in payment of that bill, Mr. Ivins?

Is it not a fact, Mr. Ivins, that after you had put in the general bill for $6,000 for two months work and after your bill had even received the indorsement of the chairman of the committee your bill was cut and that you only received $4,016.66?

Who cut your bill, and why was it cut, Mr. Ivins?

Was it not cut by James A. Roberts, then Comptroller of the State, who declined to pay you $6,000 for your services?

How was that specific amount of $4,016.66 reached?

What items, Mr. Ivins, included in the general charge of $6,000 were objected to and disallowed by the Comptroller?

The following document which is now submitted to you, Mr. Ivins, appears to be rather foggy. Please read it to the jury, Mr. Ivins:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
ALBANY CITY AND COUNTY, } ss.

WILLIAM M. IVINS, being sworn, says that the several sums charged in the annexed account, amounting to $———— for services are correct and have been actually rendered by him in the performance of his official duties as counsel to Assembly committee in the investigation of Brooklyn strike; that the amount charged is reasonable and just and no part of the same has been paid or satisfied. WM. M. IVINS.

Sworn to before me this 26th day of June, 1895.
GEO. B. HEATH, Notary Public, N. Y. Co.

Thank you, Mr. Ivins. Now, will you kindly explain to the jury what you mean in that affidavit when you say "the several sums charged in the annexed account, amounting to $————, for services are correct," when, as a matter of fact, but one sum is mentioned in the account, that of $6,000?

Did you include in the $6,000 your disbursements?

Why did you not file a Schedule B in this instance as you did in the case of the Fassett committee?

By what process of reasoning did the Comptroller cut your bill from $6,000 to $4,016.66?

There is nothing on the bill to show why it was cut, is there, Mr. Ivins?

Please explain, Mr. Ivins, why you failed or neglected to insert any amount in the affadavit attached to your bill?

Inasmuch, Mr. Ivins, as there is no sum mentioned in your affidavit, how could you in the presence of Notary Heath swear "that the amount charged is reasonable and just"?

There is no desire, Mr. Ivins, to pester you with trifles, and ignoring the fact that you failed or neglected to mention a sum in your affidavit, how did you come to accept $4,016.66 in payment for a general charge of $6,000 if the services had been actually rendered and the charge was reasonable and just?

Hearing adjourned until further notice.

Misdeeds of a West Virginia "Clang."

Hattie correspondence of the Calhoun Chronicle.

In your much beloved paper of last week I find from the pen of Mr. Ell of Index an article about the saturating of a dog with oil and then setting the dog on fire, and Mr. Ell says that Preacher A. G. Dobbins did it. I want to say for the preacher and for the benefit of Mr. Ell and the readers of your paper that he did not do it, neither did he have any knowledge of it until it was all over, but that it was done by a clang that live in that neighborhood, who raided the preacher's corn field at night and took about fifteen bushels of corn and hauled it to Yellow Creek and sold it there, and that the same clang would carry off the preacher's corn and trade for roast to pickle and eat them, and go to church and sing and shout and bless God that they had their belly full once more. Get there, Ell! Yours truly, A. G. DOBBINS.

A Question of Scotch Pronunciation.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Dr. Frank Damrosch is now drilling the People's Choral Union in singing the song by Robert Burns entitled "Ay, Wakin' O." He pronounces the first word as if it were "I."

The dictionaries, and especially Scottish lexicons, say that "ay," meaning "ever, forever," and as an interjection, is pronounced with "a" long as in "pay." As interjection it is used in such a phrase as "Ay me, but life is hard!" The only time "ay" is sounded like "I" is when it means yea, yes. So I cannot understand Dr. Damrosch's reason for his pronunciation.

However, a Scotchman who recites Burns at entertainments agrees with Dr. Damrosch; yet surely "ay" in the song does not mean "yes."

NEW YORK, January 16. H.

The Philadelphia Punster.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* That dial of our City Hall clock which faces southward shone out last night with vivid green rays. "Ah!" said the complacent Philadelphia voter, "It's creeping up! Just as I thought! Gang green!"

PHILADELPHIA, January 15. C. S. P.

Defensive Music.

"I had to drown the yelling of the baby in the flat below," said Wagner.

Thus a new style of music was born to the world.